

Group Art 2133

Patent Application

Inventor(s)

Josef Schmid

Case

3

Serial No.

10/075,868

February 13, 2002

File Date

File Date

February 13, 2002

Examiner

John J. Tabone, Jr.

Title

Boundary Scan Delay Chain For Cross-Chip

Delay Measurement

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS AND TRADEMARK

Outpation

The Commission of th

Dear Sir:

AMENDMENT

In response to the Office Action dated August 2, 2004, please consider the following remarks on the above-identified patent application as follows.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT APPLICAT

Josef Schmid

CASE

3

Serial No.

10/075868

Group Art Unit 2133

Filed

February 13, 2002

Examiner

J. J. Tabone, Jr.

Title

Boundary Scan Delay Chain For Cross-Chip Delay Measurement

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

Enclosed is an amendment in the above-identified application.

NO ADDITIONAL FEE REQUIRED

In the event of non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or to credit **Deposit Account No. 12-2325** as required to correct the error.

Respectfully,

Julio A. Garceran

Heg. No. 37,138 (908) 582-7294

Date:

10/29/04

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)

Lucent Technologies Inc. 101 Crawfords Corner Road Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

Page 1 of 1

PECENED Group 2700

Introductory Comments:

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-13 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,539 to Jacobson et al. ("Jacobson"). The Examiner rejected claims 6, 14-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. section 102(e) ("believed to be 103(a)") as being unpatentable under Jacobson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,779 to Whetsel ("Whetsel"). The Examiner also rejected the claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. section 102(e) ("believed to be 103(a)") as being unpatentable under Jacobson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. US-2002/0112213 to Abadir et al. ("Abadir").

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 12 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner objected to claims 1, 8, 15, 18 and 19 and the specification for various informalities. Finally, the Examiner objected to the drawings.